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#### Abstract

In this paper, we will establish elliptic regularity estimates on families of gravitational instantons whose model metric near infinity collapse to a flat 3 dimensional space. We show that the constants in these estimates can be chosen uniformly for the whole family of metrics. We apply these results to the Laplacian and show it is Fredholm. We also determine between which weighted spaces it is an isomorphism.


## Contents

1 Introduction ..... 2
1.1 Setup ..... 4
1.2 Results ..... 5
2 Weighted elliptic estimates ..... 8
2.1 Definition of the weighted norms ..... 9
2.2 Recipe for weighted elliptic estimates ..... 14
3 Fredholm theory for the Laplacian ..... 17
4 Invertibility of the Laplacian ..... 21
4.1 Invertibilitv in Sobolev spaces ..... 24
4.2 Invertibility in Hölder spaces ..... 27

## 1 Introduction

Gravitational instantons are complete, non-compact, hyperkähler manifolds of dimension four with $L^{2}$-bounded curvature. The first construction of gravitational instantons were found in the late 70's, and in 1989 all asymptotically locally euclidean (ALE) gravitational instantons are classified by Kronheimer (1989). Over the years other, non-ALE, gravitational instantons were found. Sun \& Zhang (2021) showed that, depending on their asymptotic metric, all gravitational instantons can be separated into 6 classes called, ALE, ALF, ALG, ALG*, ALH and ALH*.

Kronheimer (1989) classified all ALE gravitational instantons in terms of the model at infinity and the cohomology classes of the triple of Kähler forms. These "Torelli theorems" for the other gravitational instantons took time to establish. (See Minerbe (2011) and Chen \& Chen (2019) for ALF, Chen \& Chen (2021) for ALG and ALH, Chen \& Viaclovsky (2021) for ALG*, Collins et al. (2022) for ALH*)

In any case, the moduli spaces for these gravitational instantons are not closed. Therefore, families of gravitational instantons can degenerate. In this paper we focus on one type of degeneration. We will set up the elliptic regularity theory and study the Fredholm properties of the Laplacian in a framework optimized for this degeneration.

To explain this degeneration, recall ${ }^{1}$ that up to some quotient by some finite group action, the metric at infinity of any gravitational instanton can be approximated by the metric found by Gibbons \& Hawking (1978). This model metric is an explicit hyperkähler metric on a circle bundle over a punctured flat 3-manifold. Even more, the circle radius is bounded for any non-ALE type gravitational instantons. In this paper we focus on families of Riemannian manifolds whose metric approximate an non-ALE type gravitational

[^0]instantons near infinity whose circle bundle collapses to the flat base space.
This analysis is interesting for three reasons. First, it will be an essential tool for gluing constructions for these gravitational instantons. Namely, for this method one picks a family of degenerating Riemannian manifolds and a function that measures the failure of the metric to be hyperkähler. To perturb these spaces into a gravitational instantons, one wishes to apply the inverse function theorem on this error map. In order for this to work, one needs that the initial error is sufficiently small and the linearization of this error map is invertible. The first condition can be taken care in the construction of the family of Riemannian manifolds. However, if one does not use the correct Banach spaces, the bound on the inverse of the linearized error map may grow so fast that the inverse function theorem cannot be applied. In this paper we will explain how to set up the analysis such that all our estimates are uniform in our scaling parameter. This can be used to show that the linearized error map has a uniform bounded inverse. In an upcoming paper the author will use this method in constructing gravitational instantons of type ALG, ALG*, ALH and ALH* by gluing multiple Atiyah-Hitchin and Taub-NUT manifolds to a bulk space that is constructed by the GibbonsHawking ansatz.

Secondly, it is interesting because it is general enough that it can be applied to other elliptic problems, than just the above gluing construction. Namely, instead of proving each elliptic regularity estimate separately, we will give in Section 2.2 a general recipe where one can convert any standard local estimate on $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ into an uniform local estimate on these families of approximate gravitational instantons. For example, it can be used in the deformation theory of anti-self-dual instantons over the space of gravitational instantons.

Finally, it is interesting because it uses a systematic and uniform approach for all the different types of gravitational instantons, while these different types have totally different behavior. For example, ALE and ALF gravitational instantons are hyperbolic manifolds while the other types are parabolic. Also the model metrics near infinity vary wildly: from a simple quotient of $\mathbb{R}^{4}$ by a finite subgroup of $S U(2)$ for ALE spaces to ALH* type gravitational instantons whose volume growth is of order $r^{4 / 3}$. The analysis of each type of gravitational instanton is studied before separately (ALF by Schroers \& Singer (2021), ALG by Chen et al. (2020), ALG* by Chen et al. (2021) and ALH*
by Hein et al. (2022)), but in order to show their differences and their similarities, we will do the analysis for all these types simultaneously and only distinguish them when the geometry forces us to.

### 1.1 Setup

In this paper we make the following assumptions and use the following notation. We assume that we have a family of complete, non-compact, 4dimensional Riemannian manifolds $\left(M_{\epsilon}, g_{\epsilon}\right)$, labeled by the parameter $\epsilon \in$ $(0,1)$.

Next, we assume that the model metric near infinity approximates the following version of the Gibbons-Hawking ansatz: Consider,

- $B$, the quotient of $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ by a non-maximal lattice, where depending on the type of gravitational instanton the topology of $B$ is given in Table 1.1 .
- $B^{\prime}$ as the complement of a large compact set in $B$.
- $P_{\infty}$, a circle bundle over $B^{\prime}$
- $h$, a positive harmonic function on $B^{\prime}$ that is given in Table 1.1. We assume $c>0$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ is chosen such that $[* \mathrm{~d} h]=c_{1}\left(P_{\infty}\right) \in H_{d R}^{2}\left(B^{\prime}\right)$.
- a connection $\eta$ on $P_{\infty}$ that satisfies the Bogomolny equation $* \mathrm{~d} h=\mathrm{d} \eta$.

|  | ALF | ALG | ALG* | ALH | ALH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $B$ | $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ | $\mathbb{R}^{2} \times S^{1}$ | $\mathbb{R}^{2} \times S^{1}$ | $\mathbb{R}^{+} \times T^{2}$ | $\mathbb{R}^{+} \times T^{2}$ |
| $h$ | $c+\frac{k}{2\|x\|}$ | $c$ | $c+k \log \|x\|$ | $c$ | $c+k\|x\|$ |

Table 1.1: Conditions for the Gibbons-Hawking model metric depending on the type of gravitational instanton. For function $h$ we assume that $c>0$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Given this data, we can equip $P_{\infty}$ with the following Riemannian metric

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{\epsilon}^{G H}=(1+\epsilon h) g_{B}+\frac{\epsilon^{2}}{1+\epsilon h} \eta^{2} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

We will often use the shorthand $h_{\epsilon}:=1+\epsilon h$. Due to the Bogomolny equation, the Kähler forms $\omega_{i}^{G H}=\epsilon \mathrm{d} x_{i} \wedge \eta+h_{\epsilon} \mathrm{d} x_{j} \wedge \mathrm{~d} x_{k}$ are an orthonormal
closed basis of the self-dual 2-forms and make $g_{\epsilon}^{G H}$ hyperkähler.
Now, let $\Gamma$ be a finite ${ }^{2}$ group of rotations in $\mathbb{R}^{3}, \mathbb{R}^{2}$ or $\mathbb{R}^{+}$respectively. Lift $\Gamma$ to a free action on $P_{\infty}$ and assume that $g_{\epsilon}^{G H}$ is invariant under this action. Then $P_{\infty} / \Gamma$ is a hyperkähler manifold and we consider this as our model space at infinity.

Finally, we wish to compare our model metric $\left(P_{\infty} / \Gamma, g_{\epsilon}\right)$ to $\left(M_{\epsilon}, g_{\epsilon}\right)$. So assume we can identify the complement of a large compact set of $M_{\epsilon}$ with $P_{\infty} / \Gamma$. To compare the metrics, assume that there is some $\nu>0$ such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N},\left|\nabla^{k}\left(g_{\epsilon}-g_{\epsilon}^{G H}\right)\right|=\mathcal{O}\left(r^{-k-\nu}\right)$. We also require that this error can be estimated uniformly in the parameter $\epsilon$.
Remark 1.1. For any $x \in B^{\prime}$, the circle radius of its fiber is of order $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$. Therefore, we can see $\epsilon$ as a scaling parameter and in the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the space $P_{\infty}$ collapses to the base space $B^{\prime}$.
Remark 1.2. Although the choices for $B$ and $h$ look very restrictive, according to Sun \& Zhang (2021) the metric $g_{\epsilon}^{G H}$ describes a generic model metric for a gravitational instanton. We only restricted our scope in our choice of degeneration.
Remark 1.3. Let $r$ be the radial coordinate on $\mathbb{R}^{3}, \mathbb{R}^{2}$ or $\mathbb{R}^{+}$when $B=\mathbb{R}^{3}$, $\mathbb{R}^{2} \times S^{1}$ or $\mathbb{R}^{+} \times T^{2}$ respectively. Considering the definition of $h$ in Table 1.1, one can show $\mathrm{d} h$ is a multiple of $\operatorname{Vol}_{S^{2}}$ or $\operatorname{Vol}_{T^{2}}$ when $B=\mathbb{R}^{3}$ or $B \neq \mathbb{R}^{3}$ respectively. Hence we can always find a connection on $P_{\infty}$ that is $r$-invariant. Even more, the space of connections modulo gauge, $H^{1}(B, \mathbb{R}) / H^{1}(B, \mathbb{Z})$, coincides with the space of $r$-invariant connections and so up to gauge transform we assume that $\eta$ is $r$-invariant.

### 1.2 Results

Our goal in this paper is twofold. First, we want to find an elliptic regularity theory on $\left(M_{\epsilon}, g_{\epsilon}\right)$ such that all elliptic estimates are uniform in the scaling parameter $\epsilon$. Because these manifolds are non-compact, we have to define suitable weighted norms. For the cases ALG* and ALH* this is non-trivial, as their metric at infinity is neither conical or cylindrical. We explain in Section 2 that after some conformal rescaling and certain universal covers,

[^1]the manifold has bounded geometry, uniform in the scaling parameter $\epsilon$. This will enable us to define the weighted norms needed for this study. In Section 2.2, we will give a general recipe how to get regularity results for any elliptic operator on these manifolds. We apply it explicitly for the Laplacian, for which we can conclude

Theorem 1.4. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$, $\alpha \in(0,1)$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ and the scaling parameter $\epsilon \in(0,1)$. Consider the weighted Hölder norm $C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}$ from Definition 2.9, the asymptotic regions $P_{\infty}$ with a neighborhood $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ and the conformal rescaling $\Omega$ from definition 2.2. There exists a constant $C>0$, uniformly in $\epsilon$, such that for any $u \in C_{l o c}^{k, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right), \Omega^{-2} \Delta u \in C_{\delta}^{k-2, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ implies $u \in C^{k, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}\right)$ and

$$
\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta u\right\|_{C_{\delta}^{k-2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{0}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}\right] .
$$

Furthermore, if $u$ vanishes on $\partial P_{\infty}^{\prime}$, then

$$
\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta u\right\|_{C_{\delta}^{k-2, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{0}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}\right] .
$$

Similar regularity results for the Laplacian in terms of Sobolev norms are given in Theorem 2.13 and 2.14.

In the second part of this paper we restrict our attention solely to the Laplacian. In Section 3 we will study its Fredholm properties. Using the fibration in the Gibbons-Hawking ansatz, we can decompose the relevant function spaces into an $S^{1}$ invariant and an $S^{1}$ non-invariant part and we can study the Laplacian on these spaces separately. For the $S^{1}$-invariant part, the Fredholm properties are already well known, because $h_{\epsilon} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}}$ equals $\Delta_{B}$. We will show that the $S^{1}$ non-invariant part does not introduce new indicial roots and does not change the index of the Laplacian. The key estimate in this section will be

Theorem 1.5. On top of the conditions of Theorem 1.4, assume that $\delta \notin \mathbb{Z}$. When the end is modelled on the ALH gravitational instanton, we also let $\epsilon<\frac{1}{2 C} \min _{P_{\infty}} h_{\epsilon}$. Then there exists $P_{\infty} \subseteq P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ and a uniform constant $C^{\prime}>0$ such that for any $u \in W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ or $u \in C_{\delta}^{2, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}\right)} & \leq C^{\prime}\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta u\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime} \backslash P_{\infty}\right)}\right] \text { or } \\
\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{2, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}\right)} & \leq C^{\prime}\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta u\right\|_{C_{\delta}^{0, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{0}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime} \backslash P_{\infty}\right)}\right] \text { respectively. }
\end{aligned}
$$

When $u$ vanishes on $\partial P_{\infty}^{\prime}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)} & \leq C^{\prime}\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta u\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime} \backslash P_{\infty}\right)}\right] \text { or } \\
\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{2, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)} & \leq C^{\prime}\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta u\right\|_{C_{\delta}^{0, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{0}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime} \backslash P_{\infty}\right)}\right] \text { respectively. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Using a standard argument one can directly conclude that $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}$ is Fredholm.

In Section 4 we determine the kernel and co-kernel for small weights. First we will focus only on the model operator on $P_{\infty}$ and determine the (co)kernel explicitly assuming Dirichlet boundary conditions. We will show that for ALF gravitational instantons, the weights can be chosen such that $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}: C_{\delta}^{k+2, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}\right) \rightarrow C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}\right)$ is an isomorphism. This is not true in general, but in Corollary 4.6 we show that we can make it isomorphic by adding a single function to its domain.

Using this knowledge we finally extend our results globally. In Section 4.1 we will recover the result by Schroers \& Singer (2021), that for $\delta \in(-1,0)$ and $A L F$ gravitational instantons, $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}: C_{\delta}^{k+2, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right) \rightarrow C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$ is an isomorphism. For the other gravitational instantons we prove
Theorem 1.6. Assume $B \neq \mathbb{R}^{3}$. Let $\rho$ be the radial function from Definition 2.4. Let $\phi$ be a smooth function on $M_{\epsilon}$, such that $\phi=\rho$ near infinity and vanishes on the interior compact set. Let $\delta \in(-1,0)$ with $|\delta|$ sufficiently small, $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ and $\alpha \in(0,1)$. For any $f \in C_{\delta}^{k-2, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$ or $f \in W_{\delta}^{k, 2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$, there exists a unique $u \in W_{\delta}^{k, 2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right) \oplus \mathbb{R} \phi$ or $u \in C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right) \oplus \mathbb{R} \phi$ respectively, such that

$$
\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u=f
$$

To show this we use the formal adjoint of $\Omega^{-2} \Delta$ and the maximum principle to get some partial results. Using Corollary 4.6, we improve these results and get Theorem 1.6 for the Sobolev case. By embedding the Hölder space inside the Sobolev spaces by tweaking the weight, we show this result is also true for the other case.
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## 2 Weighted elliptic estimates

A standard tool for elliptic operators on non-compact manifolds is the use of weighted spaces. We will use weighted operators on an unweighted Banach space instead. To explain this, we shortly revisit the Laplacian $\Delta$ on $\mathbb{R}^{3}$. Instead of working with $\Delta$, let $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ and consider the weighted operator $L_{\delta}:=r^{2-\delta} \Delta^{\text {Eucl }}\left(r^{\delta} \ldots\right)$ on the fixed Banach space induced by the metric $g_{c f}:=r^{-2} g_{\text {Eucl }}$ instead. This operator is strictly elliptic and hence for any pair of small open balls $B_{r_{1}}(x) \subset \subset B_{r_{2}}(x)$, we have the Schauder estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|u\|_{W_{c f}^{2,2}\left(B_{r_{1}}(x)\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|r^{2-\delta} \Delta\left(r^{\delta} u\right)\right\|_{W_{c f}^{2,2}\left(B_{r_{2}}(x)\right)}+\|u\|_{L^{2}\left(B_{r_{2}}(x)\right)}\right] . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Because the coefficients of $L_{\delta}$ can be bounded uniformly in $x$ and $g_{c f}$ is the cylindrical metric on $\mathbb{R} \times S^{2}$, the constant $C$ can be chosen uniformly in $x$. Hence by a summation argument one can find $0<R^{\prime}<R$ such that

$$
\|u\|_{W_{c f}^{2,2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{R}(0)\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|r^{2-\delta} \Delta\left(r^{\delta} u\right)\right\|_{W_{c f}^{2,2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{R^{\prime}}(0)\right)}+\|u\|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{R^{\prime}}(0)\right)}\right] .
$$

In Bartnik (1986), we have the weighted norm

$$
\|\ldots\|_{W_{\delta}^{k, 2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash K\right)}^{2}:=\sum_{j=0}^{k}\left\|r^{j-\delta-\frac{3}{2}} \nabla^{j} \ldots\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash K\right)}^{2}
$$

with $\delta \in \mathbb{R}, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$ compact. Because (the derivatives of ) $\mathrm{d} \log r$ are bounded in $g_{c f}$, the metric $\|\ldots\|_{W_{\delta}^{k, 2}}$ is equivalent to $\left\|r^{-\delta} \ldots\right\|_{W_{c f}^{k, 2}}$. So we can rephrase our estimate in terms of weighted norm:

$$
\|u\|_{W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{R}(0)\right)} \leq C\left[\|\Delta u\|_{W_{\delta-2}^{2,2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{R^{\prime}}(0)\right)}+\|u\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{R^{\prime}}(0)\right)}\right] .
$$

The upshot of this calculation is that studying weighted norms is equivalent to studying weighted operators and these weighted operators can be studied using the standard regularity results, which are already well established in literature.

### 2.1 Definition of the weighted norms

In order to apply the above 'weighted operator' method for our gravitational instantons, we need to study the dependence of the constant $C$ on the collapsing parameter $\epsilon$ in equation 2. In the above example, we used the translation and rotation invariance of the metric $g_{c f}=\mathrm{d} \log r^{2}+g_{S^{2}}$ and uniform bounds on the coefficients of $L_{\delta}$ to argue that $C$ does not depend on $x$. Instead using the symmetries of $g_{c f}$, one can make the same conclusion using bounded geometry: A complete Riemannian manifold $(M, g)$ has bounded geometry if the injectivity radius is bounded below and the first $k$ derivatives of the Ricci curvature are bounded above, for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$. Riemannian manifolds with bounded geometry are interesting, because they can be equipped with coordinate charts that are suitable for analysis:

Theorem 2.1 (Theorem 1.2 in Hebey (1999)). Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha \in(0,1)$ and $Q>1$. Let $(M, g)$ be a Riemannian manifold with bounded geometry. There exists a constant $r_{H}>0$ such that for any $p \in M$, there are coordinates $\left\{x_{i}\right\}$ on $B_{r_{H}}(p)$ that satisfy $Q^{-1} \delta_{\mu \nu}<g_{\mu \nu}<Q \delta_{\mu \nu}$ as bilinear forms, and

$$
\sum_{1<j<k} r_{H}^{j} \sup _{y \in B_{r}(p)}\left|\partial^{(j)} g(y)\right|+r_{H}^{k+\alpha} \sup _{\substack{y, z \in B_{r}(p) \\ y \neq z}} \frac{\left|\partial^{(k)} g(y)-\partial^{(k)} g(z)\right|}{|y-z|^{\alpha}}<Q-1 .
$$

The constant $r_{H}$ depends on $k, \alpha, Q$, the injectivity radius and the $C^{0}$ norm of (the first $k$ derivatives of) the Ricci tensor.

The coordinates found in Theorem 2.1 are called harmonic coordinates, because they satisfy $\Delta x_{i}=0$. Like the injectivity radius estimates the largest ball on which the Riemann normal coordinates are defined, measures $r_{H}$ the largest ball on which the harmonic coordinates has $C^{k, \alpha}$ control of the metric. Therefore, the constant $r_{H}$ is referred as the harmonic radius in literature.

Theorem 2.1] gives an alternative proof that the constant $C$ in equation 2 does not depend on $x$. Namely, if the constants $r_{1}, r_{2}$ in Equation 2 are less than the harmonic radius, Equation 2 follows directly from the standard Schauder estimate in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ and the local $C^{k, \alpha}$ equivalence of the metric. Moreover, one can find harmonic coordinates centred at every $x \in \mathbb{R}^{3}$.

If the bounds on the injectivity radius and the Ricci tensor are uniform in the scaling parameter $\epsilon$, Theorem 2.1 imply our estimates are uniform in $\epsilon$.

With this in mind, we now will define a conformal rescaling for our family of gravitational instantons.

Definition 2.2. Let $g^{G H}=h_{\epsilon} g_{B}+\epsilon^{2} h_{\epsilon}^{-1} \eta^{2}$ be the Gibbons-Hawking metric. Let $B$ be defined in Table 1.1 and $r$ be the radial parameter defined in Remark 1.3. Let $\Omega$ be a strictly positive function on $M_{\epsilon}$ such that

$$
\left.\Omega\right|_{P_{\infty}}= \begin{cases}h_{\epsilon}^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \text { if } B=\mathbb{R} \times T^{2} \\ r^{-1} h_{\epsilon}^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \text { otherwise } .\end{cases}
$$

Define the conformally rescaled metric $g_{c f}$ as

$$
g_{c f}=\Omega^{2} \cdot g_{\epsilon} .
$$

The difference between these cases is due to the fact that $S^{1}$-invariant harmonic functions on $\mathbb{R} \times T^{2}$ have exponential rather than polynomial growth or decay. The conformal rescaling of $h_{\epsilon}^{-1}$ in $\Omega$ is convenient, because for $S^{1}$ invariant functions the analysis reduces to the standard analysis on $\mathbb{R}^{n}$. This is due to the fact that $h_{\epsilon} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}}=\Delta^{B}$ for $S^{1}$ invariant functions.

To check whether this metric has bounded geometry, one first need to estimate the derivatives of the Ricci tensor. Because the Gibbons-Hawking metric is given explicitly, one can find the Christoffel symbols using the Koszul formula. Using explicit calculation one can show:

Lemma 2.3. On the asymptotic region $\left(P_{\infty}, g_{c f}\right)$, The Ricci curvature tensor and its first $k$ covariant derivatives are given in terms of the first $k+1$ covariant derivatives of $\mathrm{d} \log \Omega$. In particular, these are uniformly bounded for $\epsilon \in(0,1)$.

Before we continue our study in the bounded geometry of $P_{\infty}$, we first define the weighted operator for the Laplacian and check whether it is elliptic.

Definition 2.4. Let $\Omega$ be as described in Definition 2.2 and $r$ be the radial parameter defined in Remark [1.3. Let $\rho$ be a strictly positive function on $M_{\epsilon}$ such that

$$
\left.\rho\right|_{P_{\infty}}= \begin{cases}r & \text { if } B=\mathbb{R} \times T^{2} \\ \log r & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

For all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, We define the weighted operator $L_{\delta}$ as $e^{-\delta \rho} \Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}\left(e^{\delta \rho} \ldots\right)$.

Using the Koszul formula, one can show $\mathrm{d} \rho$ has norm one and all its derivatives are bounded uniformly for $\epsilon \in(0,1)$. Therefore, we use this as the radial parameter by which we will measure decay. Using the bounds on $\mathrm{d} \rho$ and its higher derivatives, one can show by explicit calculation that $L_{\delta}$ is strictly elliptic in the sense of Gilbarg \& Trudinger (2001):

Proposition 2.5. For each $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, the operator $L_{\delta}$ is a strictly elliptic operator with bounded coefficients between $C_{c f}^{k+2, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}\right)$ and $C_{c f}^{k, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}\right)$, uniformly in $\epsilon \in(0,1)$. That is, if one considers the local coordinates given in Theorem 2.1 and expands $L_{\delta}$ as

$$
L_{\delta}=a^{i j} \partial_{i} \partial_{j}+b^{i} \partial_{i}+c,
$$

then there exist $\lambda, \Lambda>0$, independent of $\epsilon$, such that

$$
-a^{i j} \xi_{i} \xi_{j} \geq \lambda|\xi|^{2} \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{4}
$$

and $\left\|a^{i j}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}},\left\|b^{i}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}},\|c\|_{C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}}<\Lambda$.
We return to the study of the bounded geometry of $P_{\infty}$. Except for the injectivity radius, all conditions stated in Theorem 2.1 are satisfied by Lemma 2.3. However, for $\mathrm{ALG}^{*}$ and ALH* gravitational instantons the injectivity radius decays to zero, because the circle fibers decay at infinity. To remedy this, we replace the fibers with their universal cover. To be precise, we will consider local trivialisations over sufficiently large, contractible open sets and we work on the universal cover over these trivialisations. We claim that, on these local universal covers, the injectivity radius is bounded below. For this we use a result by Cheeger et al. (1982), which states that it is sufficient to get a lower bound on $\operatorname{Vol}_{c f}\left(B_{1}(p)\right)$ for all $p \in P_{\infty}$. Secondly, we will determine how the Sobolev and Hölder norms change when we project them back to neighborhoods on $P_{\infty}$.

Lemma 2.6. On local universal covers of $P_{\infty}$, the injectivity radius is bounded below, uniformly in $\epsilon \in(0,1)$.

Proof. We explain the case $B=\mathbb{R} \times T^{2}$. Pick $p=\left(x_{0}, 0\right) \in P_{\infty}$ and choose $\varrho>0$ such that the ball $B_{\varrho}\left(x_{0}\right) \subset B$ is contractible. Next, we trivialize $P \mid B_{\varrho}\left(x_{0}\right) \simeq B_{\varrho}\left(x_{0}\right) \times S^{1}$ and consider the following rectangular neighborhood on its universal cover:

$$
R_{\varrho}(p):=\left\{(x, t) \in B_{\varrho}\left(x_{0}\right) \times \mathbb{R}:|t|<\frac{h_{\epsilon}(x)}{\epsilon} \varrho\right\}
$$

We claim $R_{\varrho}(p)$ lies inside a circumscribed ball of fixed length. To show this, pick $(x, t) \in R_{\rho}(p)$ and consider the path that goes parallel along the coordinate axis. Using the gauge fix in Remark 1.3, the length of this path is bounded above by some uniform constant $C>0$, and so $R_{\varrho}(p)$ lies inside the ball of radius $C$ centred at $p$. The volume of $R_{\varrho}(p)$ is equal to

$$
\operatorname{Vol}_{c f}\left(R_{\varrho}(p)\right)=\int_{x \in B_{\varrho}\left(x_{0}\right)} \int_{-\frac{h_{\epsilon}}{\epsilon} \varrho}^{\frac{h_{\epsilon}}{\epsilon} \varrho} \frac{\epsilon}{h_{\epsilon}} \operatorname{Vol}_{g_{B}} \wedge \mathrm{~d} t=2 \operatorname{Vol}_{g_{B}}\left(B_{\rho}\left(x_{0}\right)\right)=\frac{8}{3} \pi \varrho^{3} .
$$

According to Cheeger et al. (1982), the injectivity radius at $p$ on $R_{\rho}(p)$ is bounded below uniformly in $\epsilon \in(0,1)$.

When $B=\mathbb{R}^{2} \times S^{1}$ the injectivity radius will still decay to zero at infinity. This is due to the term $\frac{1}{e^{\rho}} g_{S^{1}}$ in the metric. However, when we consider $P_{\infty}$ as a $T^{2}$ bundle and use this unwrapping trick for both decaying fibers at the same time, we still get a lower bound on the injectivity radius.

Finally, we relate periodic functions on these universal local covers to functions on $P_{\infty}$. When using Sobolev norms, one has to take account of the number of fundamental domains are covered inside a ball of certain radius. This is not necessary for Hölder norms, due to the use of supremum norms.

Lemma 2.7. Let $V \subseteq P_{\infty}$ be open such that $V$ restricts to a trivial $S^{1}$ bundle or $T^{2}$-bundle respectively over a contractible base space. Let $\hat{V}$ be the universal cover of $V$. Then, for any $u \in C_{c f}^{k, \alpha}(V)$,

$$
\|u\|_{C_{c f}^{k, \alpha}(V)}=\|\hat{u}\|_{C_{c f}^{k, \alpha}(\hat{V})},
$$

where $\hat{u}$ is the lift of $u$ in $C_{c f}^{k, \alpha}(\hat{V})$.
Lemma 2.8. Let $r>0$ be less than the injectivity radius found in Lemma 2.6. Let $p \in P_{\infty}$, let $B_{r}(p)$ be the ball of radius $r$ in $P_{\infty}$ and let $\hat{B}_{r}(p)$ be the ball of radius $r$ on the local universal cover of $P_{\infty}$ at $p$. Consider the function

$$
v^{2}= \begin{cases}\frac{e^{\rho} h_{\epsilon}}{h_{\epsilon}} & \text { if } B=\mathbb{R}^{3} \\ \frac{e^{\rho} \rho h_{\epsilon}}{\epsilon} & \text { if } B=\mathbb{R}^{2} \times S^{1} \\ \frac{h_{\epsilon}}{\epsilon} & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

Then, there exist $1<M_{1}<M_{2}$ and $0<C_{1}<C_{2}$, independent of $p$ and $\epsilon$, such that for all $u \in L^{2}\left(B_{r}(p)\right)$

$$
C_{1}\|v \cdot u\|_{L_{c f}^{2}\left(B_{r / M_{2}}(p)\right)} \leq\|\hat{u}\|_{L_{c f}^{2}\left(\hat{B}_{r / M_{1}}(p)\right)} \leq C_{2}\|v \cdot u\|_{L_{c f}^{2}\left(B_{r}(p)\right)}
$$

where $\hat{u}$ is the periodic lift of $u$ on $\hat{B}_{r}(x)$.
To prove Lemma 2.8, one has to count the number of fundamental domains inside and around $\hat{B}_{r / M_{1}}(p)$ and compare this to the function $v$. This gives the constants $C_{1}$ and $C_{2}$. To do this explicitly it is easier to use the rectangular neighborhoods used in the proof of Lemma 2.6. For this, one needs to estimate its inscribed and circumscribed balls, which gives the constants $M_{1}$ and $M_{2}$.

In summary, the following weighted norms will be the most suited norms for analysis on $\left(M_{\epsilon}, g_{\epsilon}\right)$ :

Definition 2.9. Let $\Omega$ and $g_{c f}$ be as described in Definition 2.2 and let $\rho$ be as in Definition 2.4. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha \in(0,1), \delta \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the weighted Hölder norm on $U \subseteq P_{\infty}$ as

$$
\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}(U)}=\left\|e^{-\delta \rho} \cdot u\right\|_{C_{c f}^{k, \alpha}(U)} .
$$

For any $k \in \mathbb{N}, \delta \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the weighted $L^{2}$ and Sobolev norm on $U \subseteq P_{\infty}$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\langle u, v\rangle_{L_{\delta}^{2}(U)} & =\left\langle e^{-\delta \rho} u, e^{-\delta \rho} v\right\rangle_{\tilde{L}^{2}(U)} \\
\|u\|_{W_{\delta}^{k, 2}(U)}^{2} & =\sum_{n=0}^{k}\left\|\left|\nabla^{n}\left(e^{-\delta \rho} \cdot u\right)\right|_{c f}\right\|_{\tilde{L}^{2}(U)}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\tilde{L}^{2}(U)$ is the $L^{2}$ norm with respect to the volume form $\widetilde{\text { Vol }}$ that is induced from Lemma 2.8. When $g_{\epsilon}=g_{\epsilon}^{G H}$,

$$
\left.\widetilde{\operatorname{Vol}}\right|_{P_{\infty}}= \begin{cases}\mathrm{d} \rho \wedge \operatorname{Vol}_{S^{2}} \wedge \eta & \text { if } B=\mathbb{R}^{3} \\ \mathrm{~d} \rho \wedge \operatorname{Vol}_{S^{1} \times S^{1}} \wedge \eta & \text { if } B=\mathbb{R}^{2} \times S^{1} \\ \mathrm{~d} \rho \wedge \operatorname{Vol}_{T^{2}} \wedge \eta & \text { if } B=\mathbb{R} \times T^{2}\end{cases}
$$

### 2.2 Recipe for weighted elliptic estimates

With all these ingredients we now have a method to establish local elliptic estimates on $P_{\infty}$. We will work out one example in detail: To rephrase the estimate ${ }^{3}$

$$
\|u\|_{C_{\mathbb{R}^{n}}^{k, \alpha}} \leq C\left[\|\Delta u\|_{C_{\mathbb{R}^{n}}^{k-2, \alpha}}+\|u\|_{C^{0}}\right]
$$

we follow the following steps:
Step 1: First we define the domains on which we apply the estimates. According to Theorem 2.1 there exists $r_{H}>0$ independent of $x \in P_{\infty}$ and $\epsilon>0$, such that the ball $\hat{B}_{r_{H}}(x)$ inside the local universal cover can be equipped with harmonic coordinates. We fix $0<r<r^{\prime}<r_{H}, k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$, $\alpha \in(0,1)$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$. For our local elliptic estimates we only consider function $u \in C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}\left(B_{r^{\prime}}(x)\right)$.

Step 2: We lift $u \in C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}\left(B_{r^{\prime}}(x)\right)$ to a periodic function $\hat{u}$ on the local universal cover inside $\hat{B}_{r^{\prime}}(x)$. Combining Definition 2.9 with Lemma 2.7, we relate $\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}\left(B_{r}^{\prime}(x)\right)}=\left\|e^{-\delta \rho} \hat{u}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{k, \alpha}\left(\hat{B}_{r}^{\prime}(x)\right)}$. Because the local universal cover has bounded geometry, the $C_{c f}^{k, \alpha}\left(\hat{B}_{r}^{\prime}(x)\right)$ norm is equivalent to the standard $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ norm induced by the harmonic coordinates. Using these coordinates, we get the elliptic estimate

$$
\left\|e^{-\delta \rho} \hat{u}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{k, \alpha}\left(\hat{B}_{r}(x)\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|L_{\delta}\left(e^{-\delta \rho} \hat{u}\right)\right\|_{C_{c f}^{k-2, \alpha}\left(\hat{B}_{r}^{\prime}(x)\right)}+\left\|e^{-\delta \rho} \hat{u}\right\|_{C^{0}\left(\hat{B}_{r}^{\prime}(x)\right)}\right] .
$$

Step 3: Using the fact that $L_{\delta}$ is invariant under deck transformations, we project down to balls on $P_{\infty}$, and by Lemma 2.7,

$$
\left\|e^{-\delta \rho} u\right\|_{C_{c f}^{k, \alpha}\left(B_{r}(x)\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|L_{\delta}\left(e^{-\delta \rho} u\right)\right\|_{C_{c f}^{k-2, \alpha}\left(B_{r}^{\prime}(x)\right)}+\left\|e^{-\delta \rho} u\right\|_{C^{0}\left(B_{r}^{\prime}(x)\right)}\right] .
$$

Using the definition of $L_{\delta}$,

$$
\left\|e^{-\delta \rho} u\right\|_{C_{c f}^{k, \alpha}\left(B_{r}(x)\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|e^{-\delta \rho} \Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{C_{c f}^{k-2, \alpha}\left(B_{r}^{\prime}(x)\right)}+\left\|e^{-\delta \rho} \hat{u}\right\|_{C^{0}\left(B_{r}^{\prime}(x)\right)}\right]
$$

and we conclude:

[^2]Proposition 2.10. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}, \delta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha \in(0,1)$. For sufficiently small $0<r<r^{\prime}$, there exists an uniform constant $C>0$ such that for all $x \in P_{\infty}$ and any distribution $u$ on $B_{r^{\prime}}(x)$ with $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u \in C_{\delta}^{k-2, \alpha}\left(B_{r^{\prime}}(x)\right)$,

$$
u \in C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}\left(B_{r^{\prime}}(x)\right)
$$

and

$$
\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}\left(B_{r}(x)\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{C_{\delta}^{k-2, \alpha}\left(B_{r^{\prime}}(x)\right)}+\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{0}\left(B_{r^{\prime}}(x)\right)}\right] .
$$

Similarly, we get a local Schauder estimate using Sobolev norms. For this we use the results on $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ from Evans (1998) (Theorem 1 in section 6.3.1) and Bandle \& Flucher (1998) (Theorem 7-12).

Proposition 2.11. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$. For sufficiently small $0<r<r^{\prime}$, there exists an uniform constant $C>0$ such that for all $x \in P_{\infty}$ and any distribution $u$ on $B_{r^{\prime}}(x)$ with $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u \in C_{\delta}^{k-2, \alpha}\left(B_{r^{\prime}}(x)\right)$,

$$
u \in W_{\delta}^{k, 2}\left(B_{r^{\prime}}(x)\right)
$$

and

$$
\|u\|_{W_{\delta}^{k, 2}\left(B_{r}(x)\right)}^{2} \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{W_{\delta}^{k-2,2}\left(B_{r^{\prime}}(x)\right)}^{2}+\|u\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(B_{r^{\prime}}(x)\right)}^{2}\right] .
$$

Proposition 2.12. Let $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha \in(0,1)$. For sufficiently small $0<r<$ $r^{\prime}$, there exists an uniform constant $C>0$ such that for all $x \in P_{\infty}$ and any $u \in C_{\delta}^{2, \alpha}\left(B_{r^{\prime}}(x)\right)$,

$$
\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{0, \alpha}\left(B_{r}(x)\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{C_{\delta}^{0, \alpha}\left(B_{r^{\prime}}(x)\right)}+\|u\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(B_{r^{\prime}}(x)\right)}\right] .
$$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.4. For this theorem we need a neighborhood $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ of $P_{\infty}$. Recall that topologically $P_{\infty}$ is a circle bundle over $\left[R_{0}, \infty\right) \times \Sigma$, where $R_{0}>0$ and $\Sigma$ is a compact space. A suitable choice of $P^{\prime}$ can be made by picking $R_{1}$ slightly smaller than $R_{0}$ and define $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ as the circle bundle over $\left[R_{1}, \infty\right) \times \Sigma$.
Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let $r$ and $r^{\prime}$ be as described in the steps for Proposition 2.10. Because $u \in C_{l o c}^{k, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$, $u$ must lie in $C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}\left(B_{r^{\prime}}(x)\right)$ for all $x \in P_{\infty}$. Proposition 2.10 states that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}\left(B_{r}(x)\right)} & \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{C_{\delta}^{k-2, \alpha}\left(B_{r^{\prime}}(x)\right)}+\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{0}\left(B_{r^{\prime}}(x)\right)}\right] \\
& \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{C_{\delta}^{k-2, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{0}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

Varying $x \in P_{\infty}$, we conclude

$$
\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}\right)}=\sup _{x \in P_{\infty}}\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}\left(B_{r}(x)\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{C_{\delta}^{k-2, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{0}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}\right] .
$$

For the boundary regularity estimate we use the same method, combined with Corollary 6.7 from Gilbarg \& Trudinger (2001), which states that, for any $x$ close to the boundary,

$$
\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}\left(B_{r}(x) \cap P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{C_{\delta}^{k-2, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{0}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}\right]
$$

The same method can be used to extend Proposition 2.12 to a global version. For Proposition 2.11, we need to use a summation method, similarly to Proposition 6.1.1 in Pacard (2008). Namely, we pick $\kappa>0$ and write $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ as the union of annuli $A_{n}:=\pi^{-1}\left(B_{R_{0}+\kappa(n+1)} \backslash B_{R_{0}+\kappa n}\right)$, and we sum the estimates for all annuli. Because the radius of the circle fiber is uniformly bounded above we can cover $A_{n}$ with a fixed number of balls such that on each ball we can apply Proposition 2.11. For large enough $\kappa$, we get the estimate

$$
\|u\|_{W_{\delta}^{k, 2}\left(A_{n}\right)}^{2} \leq C \sum_{m=n-1}^{n+1}\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{W_{\delta}^{k-2,2}\left(A_{m}\right)}^{2}+\|u\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(A_{m}\right)}^{2}\right]
$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Taking the union over the first $N$ annuli yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{W_{\delta}^{k, 2}\left(\cup_{n=1}^{N} A_{n}\right)} & \leq 3 C \sum_{n=0}^{N+1}\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{W_{\delta}^{k-2,2}\left(A_{n}\right)}+\|u\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(A_{n}\right)}\right] \\
& \leq 3 C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{W_{\delta}^{k-2,2}\left(\cup_{n=0}^{N+1} A_{n}\right)}+\|u\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(\cup_{n=0}^{N+1} A_{n}\right)}\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

If one assumes that $u$ vanishes on the boundary of $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$,

$$
\|u\|_{W_{\delta}^{k, 2}\left(\cup_{n=0}^{N} A_{n}\right)} \leq 3 C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{W_{\delta}^{k-2,2}\left(\cup_{n=0}^{N+1} A_{n}\right)}+\|u\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(\cup_{n=0}^{N+1} A_{n}\right)}\right]
$$

Taking the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ we conclude:

Theorem 2.13. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$. There exists a uniform constant $C>0$ such that for any $L_{\delta}^{2}$-bounded $u \in W_{l o c}^{k, 2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right), \Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u \in W_{\delta}^{k-2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ imply $u \in W_{\delta}^{k, 2}\left(P_{\infty}\right)$ and

$$
\|u\|_{W_{\delta}^{k, 2}\left(P_{\infty}\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{W_{\delta}^{k-2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}\right] .
$$

Furthermore, if $u$ vanishes on $\partial P_{\infty}^{\prime}$, then

$$
\|u\|_{W_{\delta}^{k, 2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{W_{\delta}^{k-2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}\right] .
$$

Theorem 2.14. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}, \alpha \in(0,1)$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$. There exists a uniform constant $C>0$ such that for any $L_{\delta}^{2}$-bounded $u \in L^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right), \Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u \in$ $C_{\delta}^{0, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ imply $u \in C_{\delta}^{0, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}\right)$ and

$$
\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{0, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{C_{\delta}^{0, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}\right] .
$$

## 3 Fredholm theory for the Laplacian

From now on we will focus on the Laplacian. Given these regularity estimates, the next step is to show $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}$ is Fredholm. A standard argument (e.g. See Pacard (2008)) shows that it is sufficient to prove Theorem 1.5, because the term $P_{\infty}^{\prime} \backslash P_{\infty}$ in this theorem can be chosen compact. The prove of this theorem will heavily base on the observation that $h_{\epsilon} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}}=\Delta^{B}$ for functions that are pulled back from $B$. On the base spaces, the Fredholm estimates are well known, and hence we only need to study functions on the fiber. We use the following Fourier decomposition:

Definition 3.1. For any continuous function u on $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ define the $S^{1}$ invariant part of $u$ as

$$
u_{b}(x, t)=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{\pi^{-1}(x)} u \eta
$$

and the $S^{1}$ non-invariant part $u_{f}=u-u_{b}$. The operators that map $u$ to $u_{b}$ and $u_{f}$ will be denoted as $\pi_{b}$ and $\pi_{f}$ respectively.

By construction, the space of continuous functions on $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ has a direct sum decomposition into $S^{1}$ invariant and $S^{1}$ non-invariant functions. Related to this splitting there are three analytical properties which turn out to be useful.

Lemma 3.2. The operators $\Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}}$ and $\pi_{b}$ commute.
Proof. Take a local trivialization of the circle bundle and perform this calculation explicitly using the $S^{1}$-invariance of the metric.

Lemma 3.3. On any $S^{1}$ invariant domain $U$, the operators

$$
\pi_{b}: C^{0}(U) \rightarrow C^{0}(U), \pi_{b}: C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}(U) \rightarrow C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}(U), \text { and } \pi_{b}: \tilde{L}^{2}(U) \rightarrow \tilde{L}^{2}(U)
$$

are bounded. The same holds for $\pi_{f}$.
Proof. The only non-trivial thing to show is that the Hölder semi-norm is bounded. So let $u \in C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}(U)$ and $x, y \in U$ such that $\left|\frac{u(x)-u(y)}{d(x, y)^{\alpha}}\right| \leq\|u\|_{C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}(U)}$. By rotating along the fiber $\left|\frac{u\left(e^{i t \cdot x}\right)-u\left(e^{i t} \cdot y\right)}{d\left(e^{i t} \cdot x, e^{i t} \cdot y\right)^{\alpha}}\right| \leq\|u\|_{C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}(U)}$. Because the metric is $S^{1}$-invariant, $\left|\frac{u\left(e^{i t} \cdot x\right)-u\left(e^{i t} \cdot y\right)}{d(x, y)^{\alpha}}\right| \leq\|u\|_{C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}(U)}$ and so averaging over $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ yields

$$
\left|\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \frac{u\left(e^{i t} \cdot x\right)-u\left(e^{i t} \cdot y\right)}{d(x, y)^{\alpha}} \mathrm{d} t\right|=\frac{\left|u_{b}(x)-u_{b}(y)\right|}{d(x, y)^{\alpha}} \leq\|u\|_{C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}(U)} .
$$

Proposition 3.4 (Poincaré inequality). Let $x \in P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ and denote the orbit of $x$ as $S^{1} \cdot\{x\}$. For any continuous function $u$ that satisfies $u=u_{f}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{C_{c f}^{0}\left(S^{1} \cdot\{x\}\right)} & \leq 2 \pi \frac{\epsilon \Omega}{\sqrt{h_{\epsilon}}}\|\mathrm{d} u\|_{C_{c f}^{0}\left(S^{1} \cdot\{x\}\right)} \\
\|u\|_{L^{2}\left(S^{1} \cdot\{x\}\right)} & \leq \frac{\epsilon \Omega}{\sqrt{h_{\epsilon}}}\|\mathrm{d} u\|_{\tilde{L}^{2}\left(S^{1} \cdot\{x\}\right)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. Let $(x, t) \in P_{\infty}^{\prime}$. Because $u$ is $S^{1}$ non-invariant, there exists a $t_{0} \in S^{1}$ such that $u\left(x, t_{0}\right)=0$. By the fundamental theorem of calculus, $u(x, t)=$ $\int_{t_{0}}^{t} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \mathrm{~d} t$. From definition [2.2 we estimate the circle radius, and hence

$$
u(x, t) \leq \int_{t_{0}}^{t}\|\mathrm{~d} u\|_{c f} \cdot\left\|\partial_{t}\right\|_{c f} \mathrm{~d} t \leq 2 \pi \frac{\epsilon \Omega}{\sqrt{h_{\epsilon}}}\|\mathrm{d} u\|_{C_{c f}^{0}\left(S^{1},\{x\}\right)}
$$

In order to find the $L^{2}$ estimate, write $u(x, t)=\sum_{n} u_{n}(x) e^{i n t}$ and note that

$$
\|u\|_{\tilde{L}^{2}\left(S^{1} \cdot\{x\}\right)}^{2}=\int|u|^{2} \mathrm{~d} t=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_{n}^{2} \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n^{2} u_{n}^{2} \leq\left\|\mathrm{d} u\left(\partial_{t}\right)\right\|_{\tilde{L}^{2}\left(S^{1} .\{x\}\right)}^{2}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\|u\|_{\tilde{L}^{2}\left(S^{1} \cdot\{x\}\right)}^{2} \leq\|\mathrm{d} u\|_{\tilde{L}^{2}\left(S^{1} \cdot\{x\}\right)}^{2} \cdot\left\|\partial_{t}\right\|_{C^{0}\left(S^{1},\{x\}\right)}^{2} .
$$

If the circle fiber collapses at infinity, this Poincaré inequality will enable us to improve Theorem 1.4 into Theorem 1.5. This is true for all cases except when $P_{\infty}$ is a trivial circle bundle, i.e. when the end is modelled on the ALH gravitational instanton. For this case we need the extra requirement that the collapsing parameter $\epsilon$ is sufficiently small.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Assume without loss of generality that $B=\mathbb{R}^{3}$ and $u \in W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$. Consider the case $u=u_{f}$ and $g_{\epsilon}=g_{\epsilon}^{G H}$. The elliptic regularity estimate from Theorem 2.13 states,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|u_{f}\right\|_{W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}\right)} & \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}} u_{f}\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\left\|u_{f}\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}\right] \\
& \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}} u_{f}\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\left\|u_{f}\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime} \backslash P_{\infty}\right)}+\left\|u_{f}\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}\right)}\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the Poincaré inequality, we rewrite this as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\|u_{f}\right\|_{W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon} G H} u_{f}\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\left\|u_{f}\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime} \backslash P_{\infty}\right)}+\right. \\
& \left.\quad+\left(\max _{P_{\infty}} \frac{\epsilon \Omega}{\sqrt{h_{\epsilon}}}\right) \cdot\left\|\mathrm{d} u_{f}\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}\right)}\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

The term $\frac{\Omega}{h_{\epsilon}}$ is at least of order $e^{-\rho}$ when the model end is ALF, ALG, ALG* or ALH* and so in those cases we can pick $P_{\infty}$ such that $\max _{P_{\infty}} \frac{\epsilon \Omega}{\sqrt{h_{\epsilon}}}<\frac{1}{2}$. In the ALH case, this condition is part of the theorems assumptions. Hence, for all model ends we conclude

$$
\frac{1}{2}\left\|u_{f}\right\|_{W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}} u_{f}\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\left\|u_{f}\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime} \backslash P_{\infty}\right)}\right] .
$$

Secondly, consider the case $u=u_{b}$ and $g_{\epsilon}=g_{\epsilon}^{G H}$. For $S^{1}$ invariant functions, $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}}$ reduces to the standard Laplacian $\Delta^{B}$ on the base space. The operator $\Delta^{B}$ is Fredholm in the norms given by Bartnik (1986) when $\delta \notin \mathbb{Z}$. By Lemma [2.3, these norms are equivalent to the Sobolev norms introduced in Definition 2.9. Therefore, there exists a uniform constant $C>0$ independent of $u$ such that

$$
\left\|u_{b}\right\|_{W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta u_{b}\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\left\|u_{b}\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime} \backslash P_{\infty}\right)}\right] .
$$

Combining these estimates and using Lemma 3.2 and 3.3, we conclude that for any $u=u_{b}+u_{f} \in W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}\right)} & \leq\left\|u_{b}\right\|_{W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}\right)}+\left\|u_{f}\right\|_{W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}\right)} \\
& \leq 4 C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}} u\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime} \backslash P_{\infty}\right)}\right],
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally, we consider the general case where $\left\|\nabla^{k}\left(g_{\epsilon}-g_{\epsilon}^{G H}\right)\right\|=\mathcal{O}\left(r^{-k-v}\right)$. Using elliptic regularity, one can find some neighborhood $P_{\infty}^{\prime \prime} \supset P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ and some constant $C^{\prime}>0$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \|u\|_{W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}\right)} \leq 4 C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}} u\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime} \backslash P_{\infty}\right)}\right] \\
& \leq C^{\prime}\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime \prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime} \backslash P_{\infty}\right)}+\right. \\
& \left.\quad+\left\|\Omega^{-2}\left(\Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}}-\Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}\right)\right\|_{o p} \cdot\|u\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime \prime}\right)}\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

For any model end we consider, one has $\lim _{\rho \rightarrow \infty}\left|\nabla_{c f}^{k}\left(g_{\epsilon}-g_{\epsilon}^{G H}\right)\right|=0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and this limit is uniform in the collapsing parameter $\epsilon$. Therefore, the operator norm of $\left\|\Omega^{-2}\left(\Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}-\Delta_{g_{\epsilon} H}\right)\right\|_{c f}$ can be chosen arbitrary small by translating the domains of $P_{\infty}, P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ and $P_{\infty}^{\prime \prime}$. Hence, by reordering, enlarging $C^{\prime}$ and redefining $P_{\infty}^{\prime \prime}$ as $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$,

$$
\|u\|_{W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}\right)} \leq C^{\prime}\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime} \backslash P_{\infty}\right)}\right]
$$

which is one of the estimations we need to show. The other estimates follow by a similar argument.

Identical to the proofs of Theorems 9.1.1 and 9.2.1 in Pacard (2008), we now conclude

Corollary 3.5. Let $W_{\delta, 0}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ be the space of all $W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ functions that satisfy $\left.u\right|_{\partial P_{\infty}^{\prime}}=0$. Under the conditions described in Theorem 1.5, the operator

$$
\Omega^{-2} \Delta: W_{\delta, 0}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)
$$

is Fredholm.

## 4 Invertibility of the Laplacian

In order to understand the index of $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}$, we will study the kernel and co-kernel of $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon} H}$ in more detail. In the case $\delta<0$, injectivity follows from the maximum principle, because for this case functions inside $C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}$ must decay. In the next proposition get an improved version for $S^{1}$ non-invariant functions.

Proposition 4.1. One can define $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ such that there exists a $\tilde{\delta}>0$, such that for any $\delta<\tilde{\delta}$ and $\alpha \in(0,1)$ there are no non-zero $u \in C_{\delta}^{2, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ that satisfy

$$
u \text { is } S^{1} \text { non-invariant, } \quad \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}} u=0, \quad \text { and }\left.\quad u\right|_{\partial P^{\prime}}=0 .
$$

Proof. Recall we defined $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ to be the circle bundle over $\left[R_{1}, \infty\right) \times \Sigma$, where $\Sigma$ is a compact set. Let $R>R_{1}$ and define $U_{r} \subset P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ to be the circle bundle over $\left[R_{1}, r\right] \times \Sigma$. Using integration by parts, one can show that for any harmonic function $u$ on $U_{r}$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$
\left\|\mathrm{d}\left(e^{-2 \delta \rho} u\right)\right\|_{L_{G H}^{2}\left(U_{r}\right)}^{2}=\int_{\partial U_{r}} e^{-4 \delta \rho} u *^{G H} \mathrm{~d} u+4 \delta^{2} \cdot\left\|e^{-2 \delta \rho} u \mathrm{~d} \rho\right\|_{L_{G H}^{2}\left(U_{r}\right)}^{2} .
$$

With respect to $g_{\epsilon}^{G H}$, the norm of $\mathrm{d} \rho$ is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{h_{\epsilon}}}$ or $\frac{1}{r \sqrt{h_{\epsilon}}}$ when $B=\mathbb{R} \times T^{2}$ or $B \neq \mathbb{R} \times T^{2}$ respectively. In any case this is bounded by one. By the Poincaré inequality, $\left\|e^{-2 \delta \rho} u\right\|_{L_{G H}^{2}\left(U_{r}\right)}^{2} \leq 2 \pi \epsilon \cdot\left\|\mathrm{~d}\left(e^{-2 \delta \rho} u\right)\right\|_{L_{G H}^{2}\left(U_{r}\right)}^{2}$ and hence

$$
\left(1-8 \pi \epsilon \delta^{2} \cdot\|\mathrm{~d} \rho\|_{C_{G H}^{0}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}^{2}\right) \cdot\left\|\mathrm{d}\left(e^{-2 \delta \rho} u\right)\right\|_{L_{G H}^{2}\left(U_{r}\right)}^{2} \leq \int_{\partial U_{r}} e^{-4 \delta \rho} u *^{G H} \mathrm{~d} u
$$

We pick $R_{1}$ and $\delta$ such that $8 \pi \epsilon \delta^{2} \cdot\|\mathrm{~d} \rho\|_{C_{G H}^{0}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}^{2}<1$.
Finally, we use the fact that $u$ vanishes on $\partial P^{\prime}$. We are left with

$$
\int_{\partial U_{r}} e^{-4 \delta \rho} u * *^{G H} \mathrm{~d} u= \begin{cases}\epsilon e^{(1-4 \delta) R} u(R) \frac{\partial u}{\partial \rho}(R) \int_{\Sigma} \operatorname{Vol}_{S^{2}} \wedge \mathrm{~d} t & \text { if } B=\mathbb{R}^{3} \\ \epsilon e^{-4 \delta R} u(R) \frac{\partial u}{\partial \rho}(R) \int_{\Sigma} \operatorname{Vol}_{S^{1} \times S^{1}} \wedge \mathrm{~d} t & \text { if } B=\mathbb{R}^{2} \times S^{1} \\ \epsilon e^{-4 \delta R} u(R) \frac{\partial u}{\partial \rho}(R) \int_{\Sigma} \operatorname{Vol}_{T^{2}} \wedge \mathrm{~d} t & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

When $u \in C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$, there is a constant $C>0$ such that

$$
\int_{\partial U_{r}} e^{-4 \delta \rho} u *^{G H} \mathrm{~d} u \leq C \cdot \begin{cases}e^{(1-2 \delta) R} & \text { if } B=\mathbb{R}^{3} \\ e^{-2 \delta R} & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

This vanishes at infinity when $\delta>0$ or when $\delta>\frac{1}{2}$. This implies that in the limit $r \rightarrow \infty,\left\|\mathrm{~d}\left(e^{-2 \delta \rho} u\right)\right\|_{L_{G H}^{2}\left(U_{r}\right)}^{2}=0$ and hence $u$ must be a multiple of $e^{\delta \rho}$. The only $S^{1}$ non-invariant function that satisfies this is the constant zero function.

Using Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 2.14, we can extend this result to Sobolev spaces:

Corollary 4.2. One can define $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ such that there exists a $\tilde{\delta}>0$, such that for any $\delta<\tilde{\delta}$ and $\alpha \in(0,1)$ there are no non-zero $u \in W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ that satisfy

$$
u \text { is } S^{1} \text { non-invariant, } \quad \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}} u=0, \quad \text { and }\left.\quad u\right|_{\partial P^{\prime}}=0 .
$$

Proposition 4.1 is not true for $S^{1}$ invariant functions. However, for these functions the Laplace equation can be explicitly be solved using the Fourier decomposition. For $\delta<1$, they are the following:
Proposition 4.3. Any $u \in C_{\delta}^{2, \alpha}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ or $u \in W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ that satisfies

$$
u \text { is } S^{1} \text { invariant, } \quad \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}} u=0, \quad \text { and }\left.\quad u\right|_{\partial P^{\prime}}=0 .
$$

will vanish when $\delta<0$. For $\delta \in(0,1)$, u must be of the form

$$
u= \begin{cases}\lambda+\mu \cdot e^{-\rho} & \text { if } B=\mathbb{R}^{3} \\ \lambda+\mu \cdot \rho & \text { otherwise },\end{cases}
$$

where $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$ are chosen such that $\left.u\right|_{\partial P_{\infty}^{\prime}}=0$.
When one uses Sobolev spaces, one can calculate the cokernel of an operator by studying the kernel of its formal adjoint. In the next proposition we make this precise. Combining this with our knowledge of the kernel from Proposition 4.3 we will get an explicit description of the range.
Proposition 4.4. Let $W_{\delta, 0}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ be the space of all $W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ functions that satisfy $\left.u\right|_{\partial P_{\infty}^{\prime}}=0$. The formal adjoint of $L_{\delta}$ is $L_{-(\delta+1)}$ when $B=\mathbb{R}^{3}$ and $L_{-\delta}$ else. Hence, under the conditions described in Theorem 1.5, $f \in L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ lies in the image of

$$
\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}: W_{\delta, 0}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)
$$

if and only if $\left\langle f, e^{\rho} \cdot v\right\rangle_{\tilde{L}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}=0$ (or $\langle f, v\rangle_{\tilde{L}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}=0$ when $B \neq \mathbb{R}^{3}$ ) for all

$$
v \in \operatorname{ker} \Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}: \begin{cases}W_{-(\delta+1), 0}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow L_{-(\delta+1)}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right) & \text { if } B=\mathbb{R}^{3} \\ W_{-\delta, 0}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow L_{-\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right) & \text { otherwise } .\end{cases}
$$

Proof. The formal adjoint can be explicitly be calculated by considering $\left\langle L_{\delta} u, v\right\rangle_{\tilde{L}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}=\left\langle u, L_{\delta}^{*} v\right\rangle_{\tilde{L}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}$ for any pair of compactly supported smooth functions $u$ and $v$ on $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$.

When $B=\mathbb{R}^{3}$ the operator is injective for $\delta<0$. According to Proposition 4.4, it must be surjective when $\delta>-1$. Hence it is an isomorphism for $\delta \in(-1,0)$. However, when $B \neq \mathbb{R}^{3}$ there is no $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}$ is injective and surjective at the same time. Hence we need to manually enlarge the domain without adding new elements to the kernel. We claim that when $B \neq \mathbb{R}^{3}, \delta<0$ and $|\delta| \ll 1$ the operator

$$
\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}}: W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right) \oplus \mathbb{R} \rho \rightarrow L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)
$$

with Dirichlet boundary conditions is the isomorphism we are looking for.
Proposition 4.5. Let $\delta \in(-1,0)$ with $|\delta|$ sufficiently small. For any $f \in$ $L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ there exists a unique $u \in W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ or $u \in W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right) \oplus \mathbb{R} \rho$ such that

$$
\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}} u=f \quad \text { and }\left.\quad u\right|_{\partial P_{\infty}^{\prime}}=0
$$

when $B=\mathbb{R}^{3}$ or $B \neq \mathbb{R}^{3}$ respectively.
Proof. We only prove the case $B \neq \mathbb{R}^{3}$. Let $u+\lambda \rho \in W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right) \oplus \mathbb{R} \rho$ such that $\Delta(u+\lambda \rho)=0$ and $u+\left.\lambda \rho\right|_{\partial P^{\prime}}=0$. Because $W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right) \oplus \mathbb{R} \rho \subset W_{-\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$, there exist $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
u+\lambda \rho=\alpha+\beta \rho
$$

Comparing decay rates, we conclude $\lambda=\beta$ and $u=\alpha$. The only constant function that is part of $W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ is the constant zero function and therefore $\alpha=0$. The boundary condition forces $\beta=0$. This proves the injectivity of $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon} H}$.

To show surjectivity we first set up some notation: Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\alpha+\rho$ vanishes on the boundary of $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$. Let $\chi$ be a smooth bump function on $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ such that $\left.\chi\right|_{\partial P_{\infty}^{\prime}}=1$ and assume that $\left\langle\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}(\chi), \alpha+\rho\right\rangle \neq 0$.

Let $f \in L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ and choose $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\left\langle f+\beta \cdot \Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}}(\chi \rho), \alpha+\rho\right\rangle=0$. By Proposition 4.4, there exists some $\hat{u} \in W_{\delta, 0}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ such that

$$
\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}}(\hat{u})=f+\beta \cdot \Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}}(\chi \rho),
$$

because $a+\rho$ spans the kernel of $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}}: W_{-\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow L_{-\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$. By construction $u:=\hat{u}-\beta \cdot \chi \rho$ is an element of $W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ and solves $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}} u=$ $f$. To satisfy the boundary condition we consider $u+\beta \cdot \rho$ instead. Because $\rho$ is harmonic, $u+\beta \cdot \rho$ is still a solution for $f$ and,

$$
u+\left.\beta \rho\right|_{\partial P_{\infty}^{\prime}}=\hat{u}+\left.\beta(1-\chi) \rho\right|_{\partial P_{\infty}^{\prime}}=0 .
$$

This proves surjectivity.
Corollary 4.6. Let $\delta \in(-1,0)$ with $|\delta|$ sufficiently small. One can define $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ such that for any $f \in L_{\delta}^{2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ there exists a unique $u \in W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ or $u \in W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right) \oplus \mathbb{R} \rho$ such that

$$
\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u=f \quad \text { and }\left.\quad u\right|_{\partial P_{\infty}^{\prime}}=0
$$

when $B=\mathbb{R}^{3}$ or $B \neq \mathbb{R}^{3}$ respectively.
Proof. This follows directly from Proposition 4.5, because invertibility is an open condition and the operator norm of $\Omega^{-2}\left(\Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}-\Delta_{g_{\epsilon} G H}\right)$ can be made arbitrary small by changing the domain of $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$.

### 4.1 Invertibility in Sobolev spaces

Having determined the (co)-kernel of the Laplacian on $P_{\infty}$, we finally are able to study the Laplacian on $M_{\epsilon}$. Because $M_{\epsilon}$ is the union of the model end $P_{\infty}$ and some compact set, elliptic regularity and Fredholm results can be extended without any proof. We only need to study the kernel and range of $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}$.

When $\delta<0$, functions inside $W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$ are forced to decay at infinity. Hence when $\delta<0$, the kernel of $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g}$ is zero due to the maximum principle. In Proposition 4.4 it is shown that the formal adjoint of $L_{\delta}$ near infinity is $L_{-(1+\delta)}$ when $B=\mathbb{R}^{3}$ or $L_{-\delta}$ else. From this we can directly conclude for which $\delta$ the co-kernel is empty:

Lemma 4.7. When $B=\mathbb{R}^{3}$, the operator $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}: W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right) \rightarrow L_{\delta}^{2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$ is an isomorphism for $\delta \in(-1,0)$. When $B \neq \mathbb{R}^{3}$, the operator $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}: W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(M_{B, n}\right) \rightarrow$ $L_{\delta}^{2}\left(M_{B, n}\right)$ is injective when $\delta<0$ and surjective when $\delta>0$.

We can't improve Lemma 4.7, because there will be an index jump at $\delta=0$ due to the constant functions. In summary, according to Lemma 4.7, there always exists an inverse, but this inverse might have the wrong decay rate. As shown in Proposition 4.5, we can remedy this by adding a certain smooth function $\phi$ to our domain. We require $\phi$ to be $\rho$ near infinity and we want that $\phi$ vanishes inside.

Proposition 4.8. Assume that $B \neq \mathbb{R}^{3}$ and assume that $g_{\epsilon}=g_{\epsilon}^{G H}$ on $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$. Let $\delta<0$ with $|\delta|$ sufficiently small and $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$. For any $f \in W_{\delta}^{k-2,2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$ there exists a $u \in W_{\delta}^{k, 2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right) \oplus \mathbb{R} \phi$ such that

$$
\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u=f
$$

Proof. By elliptic regularity it is sufficient to show that $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}: W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right) \oplus$ $\mathbb{R} \phi \rightarrow L_{\delta}^{2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$ is surjective. Let $f \in L_{\delta}^{2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$. By Lemma 4.7 there exists a $u \in W_{-\delta}^{2,2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$ such that

$$
\Omega^{-2} \Delta u=f
$$

Our goal is to show that $u \in W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right) \oplus \mathbb{R} \phi$. Let $\chi$ be a small bump function on $M_{\epsilon}$ that equals 1 on $\partial P_{\infty}^{\prime}$. By Corollary 4.6 there exist a function $u_{\infty} \in W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}}\left(u_{\infty}+\lambda \phi\right) & =f-\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}}(\chi u), \\
\left.\left(u_{\infty}+\lambda \phi\right)\right|_{\partial P_{\infty}^{\prime}} & =0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

The term $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}}(\chi u)$ is added, because it induces the conditions

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon} H}\left(u_{\infty}+\chi u+\lambda \phi\right)=f, \\
\left.\left(u_{\infty}+\chi u+\lambda \phi\right)\right|_{\partial P_{\infty}^{\prime}}=u .
\end{array}
$$

At the same time, the restriction of $u$ to the region $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ also satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}}(u) & =f \\
\left.u\right|_{\partial P_{\infty}^{\prime}} & =u,
\end{aligned}
$$

and hence $u_{\infty}+\chi u+\lambda \phi-u$ is a harmonic function on $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions. Because $W_{\delta}^{2,2} \oplus \mathbb{R} \phi$ is a subset of $W_{-\delta}^{2,2}$, and the harmonics of $W_{-\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$ are known by Proposition 4.3,

$$
u_{\infty}+\chi u+\lambda \phi-u=\alpha+\beta \rho
$$

for some $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. From this we make two observations: First, $u+\alpha+(\beta-\lambda) \phi$ is an element of $W_{-\delta}^{2,2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$, and secondly, it is also equal to $u_{\infty}+\chi u \in$ $W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)$. Because $M_{\epsilon}$ is the union of a compact set with $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ and all weighted $W^{2,2}$ norms on compact sets are equivalent,

$$
u+\alpha+(\beta-\lambda) \phi \in W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)
$$

We conclude $u+\alpha \in W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right) \oplus \mathbb{R} \phi$ and $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}(u+\alpha)=f$, which proves surjectivity.
Proposition 4.9. Assume that $B \neq \mathbb{R}^{3}$ and assume that $g_{\epsilon}=g_{\epsilon}^{G H}$ on $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$. Let $\delta \in(-1,0)$ with $|\delta|$ sufficiently small and $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$. The operator

$$
\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}: W_{\delta}^{k, 2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right) \oplus \mathbb{R} \phi \rightarrow L_{\delta}^{2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)
$$

has a trivial kernel.
Proof. Assume the contrary, and let $v$ be a non-zero element of $W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\Delta(v+\lambda \phi)=0$. If $\lambda=0$, Lemma 4.7 implies $v=0$ which contradicts our assumption. Therefore, we can rescale our harmonic function such that $\lambda=1$.

We claim that our assumption implies surjectivity of $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}: W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right) \rightarrow$ $L_{\delta}^{2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$. Indeed, let $f \in L_{\delta}^{2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$. By Proposition 4.8 there must be a $u \in$ $W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$ and a $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}(u+\lambda \phi)=f$. By our choice of $v$, we also have

$$
\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}(u-\lambda v)=\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}(u+\lambda \phi-\lambda(v+\phi))=f
$$

Hence $u-\lambda v \in W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$ is an inverse of $f$.
We claim that surjectivity of $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}: W_{\delta}^{2,2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right) \rightarrow L_{\delta}^{2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$ leads to a contradiction. Indeed, when $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}$ is surjective, then $L_{\delta}$ is surjective and its formal adjoint must be injective. On the asymptotic part of $M_{\epsilon}$, the formal adjoint is $L_{-\delta}$. Because $\delta<0$, the constants are part of the kernel of $L_{\delta}^{*}$, but we just have shown that the kernel of $L_{\delta}^{*}$ is trivial. Therefore, $v$ does not exist.

Lemma 4.7 and Propositions 4.8 and 4.9 prove Theorem 1.6 for the Sobolev norm under the extra assumption that $g_{\epsilon}=g_{\epsilon}^{G H}$ on the asymptotic region $P_{\infty}^{\prime}$. Because invertibility is an open condition and the operator norm of $\Omega^{-2}\left(\Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}-\right.$ $\Delta_{g_{\epsilon}^{G H}}$ ) can be made arbitrary small, this extra condition is superfluous.

### 4.2 Invertibility in Hölder spaces

For any $\tilde{\delta}>\delta$, the space $C_{\delta}^{0}\left(M_{B, n}\right)$ embeds into $L_{\tilde{\delta}}^{2}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$. Therefore, the isomorphism from Theorem 1.6 for the Sobolev case and the regularity result from Theorem 2.14 imply that for any $f \in C_{\delta}^{0, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$ and $\tilde{\delta}>\delta$, there exists a $u \in C_{\tilde{\delta}}^{2, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$ (or $u \in C_{\tilde{\delta}}^{2, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right) \oplus \mathbb{R} \phi$ ) such that $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u=f$. To make $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}$ into an actual isomorphism, we need to regain the weight that we have lost in the embedding, i.e. we need to show that $u \in C_{\delta}^{2, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$ (or $\left.u \in C_{\delta}^{2, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right) \oplus \mathbb{R} \phi\right)$.

In order to regain the weight, we are going to study the family of functions $u_{\tilde{\delta}}$ that solve $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u_{\tilde{\delta}}^{\tilde{\delta}}=f$ for some fixed $f \in C_{\delta}^{0, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$ and we will see if we can take the limit $\tilde{\delta}$ to $\delta$. At first sight this limit should not converge in $C_{\tilde{\delta}}^{2, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$ or $C_{\tilde{\delta}}^{2, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right) \oplus \mathbb{R} \phi$. Namely, the weight function $e^{\tilde{\delta} \rho}$ does not converge to $e^{\delta \rho}$ uniformly. Therefore, any $C_{\delta}^{2, \alpha}$ estimate of $u_{\tilde{\delta}}$ will likely diverge. We will circumvent this issue by considering pointwise convergence and only use uniform convergence on compact sets. For this to work we first need to extend Theorem 1.5 globally and study the behavior of its constants under perturbation of weight.

Lemma 4.10. Let $\delta_{\min }, \delta_{\max } \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\left[\delta_{\min }, \delta_{\max }\right] \subset \mathbb{R} \backslash \mathbb{Z}$. On top of the conditions of Theorem [1.5, assume that $\delta \in\left[\delta_{\min }, \delta_{\max }\right]$. There exists a compact set $K$ and a constant $C>0$, depending on $\epsilon$, $\delta_{\min }$ and $\delta_{\max }$ such that for any $u \in C_{\delta}^{2, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$,

$$
\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{2, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{C_{\delta}^{0, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)}+\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{0}(K)}\right] .
$$

Remark 4.11. Before we were able to to show that all are estimates are uniform in $\epsilon$. This was possible, because we controlled the geometry of the asymptotic region of $M_{\epsilon}$. If we have a uniform elliptic regularity estimate on the interior of $M_{\epsilon}$ - for example, we have uniform bounded geometry on the interior of $M_{\epsilon}$ - then the constant in the above lemma can be chosen uniform w.r.t. $\epsilon$. As we haven't put any conditions on the compact region of $M_{\epsilon}$, this uniformity of the estimate cannot be guaranteed.

Proof of Lemma 4.10. Let $P_{\infty} \subset P_{\infty}^{\prime}$ be the asymptotic regions defined in Theorem 1.5, Let $K^{\prime} \subset K^{\prime \prime}$ compact subsets of $M_{\epsilon}$, such that they both cover $M_{\epsilon} \backslash P_{\infty}$. By elliptic regularity of $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}$, there exists a constant
$C>0$, depending on $\epsilon$ and $\delta$, such that

$$
\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{2, \alpha}\left(K^{\prime}\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{C_{\delta}^{0, \alpha}\left(K^{\prime \prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{0}\left(K^{\prime \prime}\right)}\right] .
$$

Combining this with the estimates of Theorem 1.5, we get

$$
\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{2, \alpha}\left(K^{\prime} \cup P_{\infty}\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{C_{\delta}^{0, \alpha}\left(K^{\prime \prime} \cup P_{\infty}^{\prime}\right)}+\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{0}\left(K^{\prime \prime} \cup\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime} \backslash P_{\infty}\right)\right)}\right] .
$$

Because $P_{\infty}^{\prime} \backslash P_{\infty}$ can be chosen compact, we set $K=K^{\prime \prime} \cup\left(P_{\infty}^{\prime} \backslash P_{\infty}\right)$ and conclude

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{2, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)} \leq C\left[\left\|\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u\right\|_{C_{\delta}^{0, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)}+\|u\|_{\left.C_{\delta}^{0}(K)\right)}\right] \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

We only need to show $C$ can be chosen uniformly in $\delta$. We prove this by using that $L_{\delta}$ is uniform in $\delta$. Indeed, assume that $C$ is not uniform in $\delta$. Then, there must be sequences $u_{i} \in C_{c f}^{2, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$ and $\delta_{i} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|u_{i}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{2, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)} & =1, & \left\|L_{\delta_{i}} u_{i}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)} & \rightarrow 0 \\
\left\|u_{i}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{0}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)} & \rightarrow 0, & \delta_{i} & \rightarrow \delta_{\lim } \in\left[\delta_{\min }, \delta_{\max }\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

We apply Equation 3 on $u_{i}$ with the limiting weight $\delta_{\text {lim }}$, which yields

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\|u_{i}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{2, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)} & \leq C\left(\epsilon, \delta_{\lim }\right)\left[\left\|L_{\delta_{\lim }} u_{i}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)}+\left\|u_{i}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{0}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)}\right] \\
& \leq C\left(\epsilon, \delta_{\lim }\right)\left[\left\|L_{\delta_{i}} u_{i}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)}+\left\|\left(L_{\delta_{\lim }}-L_{\delta_{i}}\right) u_{i}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)}+\left\|u_{i}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{0}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)}\right] . \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

For any $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$,
$L_{\delta} u_{i}=e^{-\delta \rho} \Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}\left(e^{\delta \rho} u\right)=\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}(u)+\delta u \cdot \Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} \rho-\delta^{2} u \cdot\|\mathrm{~d} \rho\|_{g_{c f}}^{2}-2 \delta\langle\mathrm{~d} u, \mathrm{~d} \rho\rangle_{g_{c f}}$
which imply that there exists a uniform constant $C^{\prime}>0$ such that

$$
\left\|\left(L_{\delta_{\lim }}-L_{\delta_{i}}\right) u_{i}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)} \leq C\left|\delta_{\lim }-\delta_{i}\right| \cdot\left\|u_{i}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{1, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)} .
$$

Hence, the right hand side of Equation 4 converge to zero. This yields a contradiction as $\left\|u_{i}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{2, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)}=1$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

With the uniform control of $C_{\epsilon}$ we can finally prove the bijectivity of $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.6, Hölder case. Let $f \in C_{\delta}^{k, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$. For any $\tilde{\delta} \in(\delta, \delta / 2)$, $f$ is an element of $L_{\tilde{\delta}}^{2}\left(M_{B, n}\right)$, and so by Theorem 1.6 there exists a $u \in$ $W_{\tilde{\delta}}^{2,2}\left(M_{B, n}\right)$ such that $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}} u=f$. By Proposition [2.12, $u$ is an element of $C_{\tilde{\delta}}^{2, \alpha}\left(M_{B, n}\right)$ and because $\Omega^{-2} \Delta_{g_{\epsilon}}$ is injective, the function $u$ does not depend on the choice of $\tilde{\delta}$.

Using elliptic regularity it is sufficient to show $u \in C_{\delta}^{0}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)$. So let $x \in M_{\epsilon}$ and consider $\left|e^{-\delta \rho} u\right|(x)$. We can estimate this as

$$
\left|e^{-\delta \rho} u\right|(x) \leq\left|e^{(\tilde{\delta}-\delta) \rho}\right|(x) \cdot\left\|e^{-\tilde{\delta}} u\right\|_{C_{c f}^{2, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)}
$$

Because $\tilde{\delta}$ is not an indicial root, we can apply Lemma 4.10,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|e^{-\delta \rho} u\right|(x) & \leq\left|e^{(\tilde{\delta}-\delta) \rho}\right|(x) \cdot C\left[\left\|e^{-\tilde{\delta} \rho} f\right\|_{C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)}+\left\|e^{-\tilde{\delta} \rho} u\right\|_{C^{0}(K)}\right] \\
& \leq\left|e^{(\tilde{\delta}-\delta) \rho}\right|(x) \cdot C\left[\left\|e^{(\delta-\tilde{\delta}) \rho}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)} \cdot\|f\|_{C_{\delta}^{2, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)}+\left\|e^{-\tilde{\delta} \rho}\right\|_{C^{0}(K)} \cdot\|u\|_{C^{0}(K)}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

The terms $\left\|e^{-\tilde{\delta} \rho}\right\|_{C^{0}(K)},\left\|e^{(\delta-\tilde{\delta}) \rho}\right\|_{C_{c f}^{0, \alpha}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)}$ and $C$ are all uniformly bounded w.r.t. $\tilde{\delta}$ : For the first term can be estimated explicitly, for the second term this follows due to the fact that $e^{(\delta-\tilde{\delta}) \rho}$ decays when $\tilde{\delta}>\delta$ and for the last term this is shown in Lemma 4.10, Therefore, there exists a constant $C^{\prime}$ that depends on $C,\|f\|_{C_{\delta}^{2, \alpha}\left(M_{B, n}\right)}$ and $\|u\|_{C^{0}(K)}$ such that $\left|e^{-\delta \rho} u\right|(x) \leq C^{\prime} \cdot\left|e^{(\tilde{\delta}-\delta) \rho}\right|(x)$.

For each $x \in M_{\epsilon}$, we pick $\tilde{\delta}>\delta$ such that $\left|e^{(\tilde{\delta}-\delta) \rho}\right|(x) \leq 2$. This gives us an estimate of $\left|e^{-\delta \rho} u\right|(x)$ which does not depend on $\tilde{\delta}$. Therefore, $\|u\|_{C_{\delta}^{0}\left(M_{\epsilon}\right)}=$ $\sup _{x \in M_{\epsilon}}\left|e^{-\delta \rho} u\right|(x) \leq 2 C^{\prime}<\infty$.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ An exposition of all possible asymptotic metrics can be found in Sun \& Zhang (2021), Chapter 6

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ When $B=\mathbb{R}^{+} \times T^{2}$, this requires $\Gamma$ to be the trivial group.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ This regularity result is a combination of Gilbarg \& Trudinger (2001), Problem 6.1, Theorem 9.19 and Folland (1995) Theorem 6.33.

